arXiv:1407.1458v1 [math.CA] 6 Jul 2014

THE MISSING PROOF OF PALEY'S THEOREM ABOUT LACUNARY COEFFICIENTS

JOHN J.F. FOURNIER

To the memory of Frank Forelli, who set me on this path.

Abstract. We modify the standard proof of Paley's theorem about lacunary coefficients of functions in H^1 to work without analytic factorization. This leads to the first direct proof of the extension of Paley's theorem that we applied to the former Littlewood conjecture about L^1 norms of exponential sums.

1. Introduction

Given an integrable function f on the interval $(-\pi, \pi]$, form its Fourier coefficients

$$\hat{f}(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) e^{-int}\, dt.$$

Use the same measure $(1/2\pi)\, dt$ in computing L^p norms. Call a set of nonnegative integers *strongly lacunary* if it is the range of a sequence, (k_j) say, with the property that

$$k_{j+1} > 2k_j \quad \text{for all } j. \tag{1.1}$$

In Section 2, we give a new proof of the following statement.

Theorem 1.1. *There is a constant C so that if K is strongly lacunary, and if $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ when $n < 0$, then*

$$\left[\sum_{k \in K} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C \|f\|_1. \tag{1.2}$$

Paley's proof [11] of this used "analytic" factorization of such functions f as products of two measurable functions with the same absolute value and with Fourier coefficients that also vanish at all negative integers. We use factors with the same absolute value, but we do not

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42A16; Secondary 42A55, 43A17.

Announced at the 6th Conference on Function Spaces in May 2010.

Research supported by NSERC grant 4822.

require that their coefficients vanish anywhere. Paley's proof used orthogonal projections of L^2 onto subspaces determined by the set K. We use subspaces that also depend on the choice of factors.

This allows us to give the first direct proofs of some refinements, stated here as Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, of Paley's theorem. They were proved in a dual way in [6], and were used there to give a new proof of "half" of Littlewood's conjecture about L^1 norms of exponential sums.

The functions in this paper are scalar-valued. Our methods also apply to some operator-valued functions, as in [8]. That extension and others will be presented elsewhere.

2. Pairs of nested projections

Proof of Paley's theorem. When f satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, let g and h be measurable functions such that $|g| = |h|$ and $g\overline{h} = f$. Let z be the exponential function mapping each number t in the interval $(-\pi, \pi]$ to e^{it}. Then g and the products $z^n h$ belong to $L^2(\pi, \pi]$. Consider the inner products

$$(g, z^n h) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g(t)\overline{h(t)} e^{-int}\, dt = \hat{f}(n). \tag{2.1}$$

It suffices to prove inequality (1.2) when the set K is the range of a finite increasing sequence $(k_j)_{j=1}^J$. Let A_j be the operator on $L^2(-\pi, \pi)$ that multiplies each function by z^{k_j}. Then

$$(g, A_j h) = \hat{f}(k_j).$$

This reduces matters to showing that there is a constant C so that

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{J} |(g, A_j h)|^2\right]^{1/2} \leq C\|g\|_2\|h\|_2. \tag{2.2}$$

Let L_j be the closure in L^2 of the subspace spanned by the products $z^n h$ in which $n < -k_j$. Let P_j project L^2 orthogonally onto L_j. These projections form a decreasing nest.

Also consider the subspaces $A_j L_j$ and $A_{j+1} L_j$. Every image $A_j L_j$ is the closure in L^2 of the span of the products $z^n h$ for which $n < 0$. By formula (2.1) and the hypothesis that $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ for all $n < 0$, the function g is orthogonal to $A_j L_j$ for all j.

When $j < J$, the image $A_{j+1} L_j$ is the closure of the span of the products $z^n h$ with $n < k_{j+1} - k_j$. Strong lacunarity is equivalent to having

$$k_j < k_{j+1} - k_j. \tag{2.3}$$

It follows that

$$A_j h \in A_{j+1} L_j \quad \text{when } j < J. \tag{2.4}$$

Since $k_j - k_{j-1} \le k_j < k_{j+1} - k_j$, the subspaces $A_{j+1}L_j$ increase as j increases. Let Q_j project orthogonally onto $A_{j+1}L_j$ when $1 \le j < J$; let $Q_0 = 0$ and $Q_J = I$. The projections Q_j form an increasing nest.

For each j, these choices and the membership condition (2.4) make

$$A_j h = Q_j A_j h \quad \text{and} \quad (g, A_j h) = (g, Q_j A_j h) = (Q_j g, A_j h).$$

Rewrite the latter in the form

$$((Q_j - Q_{j-1})g, A_j h) + (Q_{j-1} g, A_j h) = a_j + b_j \quad \text{say.} \tag{2.5}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fact that the operators A_j are contractions, and the nesting of the projections Q_j,

$$\|(a_j)\|_2^2 \le \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J} \|(Q_j - Q_{j-1})g\|_2^2 \right) \|h\|_2^2 \le \|g\|_2^2 \|h\|_2^2. \tag{2.6}$$

Note that $b_1 = 0$, since $Q_0 = 0$. When $j > 1$, the fact that A_j is unitary and the definitions of P_{j-1} and Q_{j-1} make $A_j P_{j-1} = Q_{j-1} A_j$ and

$$b_j = (g, Q_{j-1} A_j h) = (g, A_j P_{j-1} h).$$

The fact that $g \perp A_j L_j$ then makes $b_j = (g, A_j(P_{j-1} - P_j)h)$. It follows that $\|(b_j)\|_2^2 \le \|g\|_2^2 \|h\|_2^2$ too. So inequality (2.2) holds with $C = 2$. $\square$

The refinements in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 below were proved in [6] using dual methods. Here, Theorem 5.1 will follow from an analysis of the proof above. The notions in the next two sections will then allow us to deduce Theorem 5.2 in a direct way.

Remark 2.1. To organize Paley's proof in the same way, replace the subspaces L_j above with the closures in L^2 of the spans of the functions z^n for which $n < -k_j$; this does not change the nesting of these subspaces or their images $A_{j+1}L_j$. Assuming that $\hat{g}(n) = 0$ for all $n < 0$ guarantees that $g \perp A_j L_j$ for all j. Assuming that $\overline{h}$ is analytic makes $\hat{h}(n) = 0$ for all $n > 0$. It follows that $A_j h \in A_{j+1} L_j$ when $j < J$. We do not know how to make this approach work under the weaker hypotheses in Theorem 5.1.

Remark 2.2. The subspaces L_j that we used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 are invariant under multiplication by $\overline{z}$, and their conjugates are invariant under multiplication by z. In the discussion in [3], it is observed, when f is analytic, that those conjugate subspaces must be simply invariant, and that one can apply the characterization of simply

invariant subspaces of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ to show that both factors $\overline{h}$ and g of f can be chosen to be analytic too.

3. Partially ordered dual groups

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 resembles the one given in [4, Section 2] for the following statement, which differs only in the set where $\hat{f}$ is required to vanish.

Theorem 3.1. *There is a constant C so that if K is strongly lacunary, and if $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ for all positive integers n lying outside K, then*

$$\left[\sum_{k\in K} |\hat{f}(k)|^2\right]^{1/2} \le C\|f\|_1. \tag{3.1}$$

Various other methods in [9, p. 533–4], [16] and [4, Theorem 10] derive this conclusion from weaker conditions on K or f. In Remark 3.3 below, we outline our direct proof of Theorem 3.1. That proof extended to compact abelian groups with totally ordered duals.

As in [14, Section 8.1], where the dual group Γ is written additively, those are the cases where there is an additive semigroup P with the two properties

$$P \cap (-P) = \{0\}, \qquad P \cup (-P) = \Gamma. \tag{3.2}$$

Our proof of Theorem 3.1 also worked for partially ordered discrete duals, where the nonnegative cone P need only satisfy the first condition above. We now confirm that our new proof of Paley's theorem extends in a similar way.

Call a subset K of P strongly lacunary if for each pair γ and γ' of distinct members of K, one of the differences $\gamma - 2\gamma'$ or $\gamma' - 2\gamma$ belongs to the strictly positive cone $P' = P\backslash\{0\}$. We will use this property and a variant of it to prove Theorem 5.2.

The following extension of Theorem 1.1 is already known [14, Section 8.6], with a different proof, in the cases where the partial order on Γ is a total order.

Theorem 3.2. *There is a constant C with the following property. Let G be a compact abelian group with a partially ordered dual Γ. Let K be strongly lacunary relative to that order. If $f \in L^1(G)$, and $\hat{f}(\gamma) = 0$ for all characters γ in the strictly negative cone $-P'$, then*

$$\left[\sum_{\gamma\in K} |\hat{f}(\gamma)|^2\right]^{1/2} \le C\|f\|_1. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, K is finite. Enumerate it in increasing order as $(\gamma_j)_{j=1}^J$. Factor f measurably as $g\overline{h}$ with $|g| = |h|$. Make the following choices for each j. Let A_j be the operator that multiplies each function in $L^2(G)$ by γ_j. Let L_j be the closure in $L^2(G)$ of the subspace spanned the products γh in which $\gamma < -\gamma_j$. Define the nested projections P_j and Q_j as before, and split the inner product $(g, A_j h)$ in the same way to get inequality (3.3) with $C = 2$. □

Remark 3.3. In [4], we proved Theorem 3.1 using the same factorization and the same operators A_j as in our proof of Theorem 1.1, but we used the subspaces M_j spanned by the products $z^n h$ in which $-k_j \le n < 0$. Those subspaces form an increasing nest, as do their images $A_j M_j$. We used orthogonal projections P_j and Q_j with ranges M_j and $A_j M_j$ respectively, with $P_0 = 0$ and $Q_{J+1} = I$. The hypothesis that $\hat{f}$ vanishes in the gaps between the indices k_j implies that $g \perp A_{j+1} M_j$ for all $j < J$. Also, $A_j h \in A_{j+1} M_{j+1}$ for these values of j. Let

$$a_j = \ ((Q_{j+1} - Q_j)g, A_j h) \quad \text{and} \quad b_j = \ (g, A_j(P_j - P_{j-1})h).$$

Then $a_j + b_j$ expands as an alternating sum of four inner products. Again, the last term in that sum vanishes, the middle two terms cancel, and the first term is equal to $(g, A_j h)$. Estimate ℓ^2 norms as above.

Remark 3.4. The proof just above was derived from Paley's proof of his Theorem 1.1, but it no longer worked for that theorem. Our new proof of the latter resulted from a study of the argument in Remark 3.3 and the proof, via analytic factorization, of the version of Theorem 1.1 in [7].

Remark 3.5. In Section 4, we use a standard construction to show that many cases of Theorem 3.2 follow from the corresponding known result for total orders. The same is true for many of the results in [4]. The method used there and the one used here are more elementary, however, and they give better values for the constants C in the various theorems.

Remark 3.6. The dual method in [6] shows that the best constant in Theorems 1.1 and 3.2 is $\sqrt{2}$. The dual method in [2] shows that the best constant in Theorem 3.1 is at most $\sqrt{e}$.

Remark 3.7. In Theorem 3.2, the set where the coefficients are required to vanish is no larger than a half space. Other methods [10] work when that set is significantly larger than a half space; in such cases, those methods yield inequality (3.3) for more sets K.

4. Finite Riesz products

We consider Fourier coefficients of certain measures in Theorem 5.2. We confirm here that Theorem 3.2 extends to regular Borel measures, with the usual convention that

$$\hat{u}(\gamma) = \int_G \overline{\gamma(x)}\, d\mu(x),$$

for such a measure μ. We also show how, in most cases of interest, Theorem 3.2 follows, with a larger constant C, from its special case where the order is total.

Denote the total variation of μ by $\|\mu\|$. Continue to work with a partial order on Γ. Suppose throughout this section that $\hat{u}$ vanishes on $-P'$.

Given a finite subset K of Γ, let $K' = K\backslash\{0\}$. Expand the product

$$R_K := \prod_{\gamma' \in K'} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma' + \overline{\gamma'}}{2}\right).$$

of nonnegative factors as a sum of finitely-many terms $c(\gamma)\gamma$, where

$$\gamma = \prod_{\gamma' \in K'} (\gamma')^{\varepsilon_{\gamma'}}$$

with $\varepsilon_{\gamma'} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ in all cases. In the additive notation for Γ,

$$\gamma = \sum_{\gamma' \in K'} \varepsilon_{\gamma'} \gamma'. \tag{4.1}$$

Denote the set of such characters γ by $\mathrm{Rsz}(K)$; this includes the identity element 0 of Γ, written as the empty sum. Then

- Each member γ of K' has a representation (4.1) with $\varepsilon_\gamma = 1$ and with $\varepsilon_{\gamma'} = 0$ otherwise.
- $c(\gamma) = 1/2$ if there are no other representations of γ.
- $c(\gamma) > 1/2$ if there are other representations of γ.

Similarly, $c(0) \geq 1$.

Now assume that K is strongly lacunary. Then

- $\mathrm{Rsz}(K) \subset P \cup (-P)$.
- The only representation (4.1) of 0 is the empty sum.

Hence $c(0) = 1$. So $\widehat{R_K}$ vanishes off $P \cup (-P)$, with

$$\widehat{R_K}(0) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{R_K}(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{when} \quad \gamma \in K'. \tag{4.2}$$

Since $R_K \geq 0$,

$$\|R_K\|_1 = \widehat{R_K}(0) = 1. \tag{4.3}$$

Let $f_K = \mu * R_K$. Then $\widehat{f_K}$ vanishes on $-P'$, and

$$\left|\widehat{f_K}(\gamma)\right| \geq \frac{1}{2}\,|\hat{\mu}(\gamma)| \quad \text{for all } \gamma \text{ in } K.$$

Applying Theorem 3.2 to f_K yields that

$$\|\hat{\mu}|K\|_2 \leq 2\left\|\widehat{f_K}|K\right\|_2 \leq 4\|f_K\|_1 \leq 4\,\|R_K\|_1\,\|\mu\| = 4\|\mu\|. \tag{4.4}$$

In many cases, the partial order on Γ extends to a total order. That is, the cone P imbeds in a larger cone $\tilde{P}$ that satisfies both conditions in line (3.2). Then the set K is strongly lacunary relative to $\tilde{P}$. Note that $\widehat{f_K}$ vanishes off P, since the support of $\widehat{R_K}$ is included in the set $P \cup (-P)$, and $\hat{\mu}$ vanishes on $-P'$. In particular, $\widehat{f_K}$ vanishes on $-\tilde{P}'$.

Theorem 3.2 is already known for the total order given by $\tilde{P}$, and yields that $\left\|\widehat{f_K}|K\right\|_2 \leq C\|f_K\|_1$. It follows as above that

$$\|\hat{\mu}|K\|_2 \leq 2C\|\mu\|. \tag{4.5}$$

Remark 4.1. We do not know how to use the method above to prove Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 below.

Remark 4.2. Using the trigonometric polynomials constructed in [1] instead of the Riesz products above gives inequality (4.4) with the constant 4 replaced by 2.

5. Analysing our method

Theorems 1.1 and 3.1 both state that if $\hat{f}$ vanishes on a suitable part of the complement of a strongly lacunary set K, then

$$\|\hat{f}|K\|_2 \leq C\|f\|_1. \tag{5.1}$$

In [5, Remark 3], an examination of the proof in Remark 3.3 of Theorem 3.1 revealed that inequality (5.1) follows, with $C = 2$, if $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ whenever n is equal to an alternating sum

$$k_{j_1} - k_{j_2} + \cdots + k_{j_{2i-1}} - k_{j_{2i}} + k_{j_{2i+1}},$$

with at least 3 terms and with a strictly increasing index sequence (j_ℓ). There is no requirement here that K be strongly lacunary, or that it be enumerated in increasing order.

We now examine our new proof of Theorem 1.1 in a similar way. Given a subset D of $\mathbb{Z}$, let $V(D)$ denote the closed subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ spanned by the products $z^n h$ for which $n \in D$. The subspaces L_j used to prove Paley's theorem had the form $V(D_j)$ with $D_j = \{n : n < -k_j\}$.

For any choice of sets D_j, let $L_j = V(D_j)$. Then

$$A_j L_j = V(D_j + k_j), \quad \text{and} \quad A_{j+1} L_j = V(D_j + k_{j+1}),$$

with $j < J$ in the latter case. We required that g be orthogonal to the subspace $A_j L_j$ for all $j > 1$. By formula (2.1), this happens if only if

$$\hat{f}(n) = 0 \quad \text{for all indices } n \text{ in the set } \bigcup_{j=2}^{J} (D_j + k_j). \tag{5.2}$$

We look for small sets D_j for which the rest of the proof works.

It uses three other properties of the subspaces L_j and their images.

(1) $A_j h \in A_{j+1} L_j$ when $j < J$.
(2) $L_j \supset L_{j+1}$ when $j < J$.
(3) $A_j L_{j-1} \subset A_{j+1} L_j$ when $1 < j < J$.

The membership condition (1) holds if

$$k_j \in k_{j+1} + D_j \quad \text{for all } j < J. \tag{5.3}$$

The subspaces L_j and their images $A_{j+1} L_j$ nest suitably if

$$D_1 \supset D_2 \supset \cdots \supset D_J, \tag{5.4}$$

$$\text{and} \quad k_2 + D_1 \subset k_3 + D_2 \subset \cdots \subset k_J + D_{J-1}. \tag{5.5}$$

The only condition on D_J is that it be included in D_{J-1}; so let D_J be the empty set. Consider the sets $G_{j+1} := k_{j+1} + D_j$ when $j < J$. The three conditions on the sets D_j correspond to requiring that

$$k_j \in G_{j+1}, \tag{5.6}$$

$$G_{j+1} - k_{j+1} \subset G_j - k_j, \tag{5.7}$$

$$\text{and} \quad G_j \subset G_{j+1} \tag{5.8}$$

when $j < J$, with $j \geq 2$ in condition (5.7). Rewrite that condition as

$$G_{j+1} - \Delta k_j \subset G_j, \tag{5.9}$$

where $\Delta k_j = k_{j+1} - k_j$. By inclusions (5.9), (5.8) and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned} G_{j+1} - 2\Delta k_j &= (G_{j+1} - \Delta k_j) - \Delta k_j \\ &\subset G_j - \Delta k_j \subset G_{j+1} - \Delta k_j \subset G_j \end{aligned}$$

So $G_{j+1} - 2\Delta k_j - \Delta k_{j-1} \subset G_{j-1}$ if $j > 2$. Iterating this reasoning shows that if i and i' are integers with $1 < i < i' < J$ and if $(m_{j'})_{j'=i}^{i'}$ is a sequence of positive integers, then $G_{i'+1} - \sum_{j'=i}^{i'} m_{j'} \Delta k_{j'} \subset G_i$. Combine this with condition (5.6) to get that

$$k_{i'} - \sum_{j'=i}^{i'} m_{j'} \Delta k_{j'} \in G_i.$$

Since $k_{i'} - \sum_{j=i}^{i'-1} \Delta k_j = k_i$, the expression on the left above is equal to

$$k_i - \sum_{j'=i}^{i'-1} (m_{j'} - 1)\Delta k_{j'} - m_{i'}\Delta k_{i'} = k_i - \sum_{j'=i}^{i'} n_{j'}\Delta k_{j'} \tag{5.10}$$

say, where $n_{j'} \geq 0$ for all j' and $n_{i'} > 0$.

When $1 < j < J$, condition (5.8) forces G_{j+1} to contain the integers of the form (5.10) when $1 < i \leq j+1$. By condition (5.6) it must also contain k_i when $1 \leq i \leq j$. When $i > 1$, combine these observations to see that G_{j+1} must contain all integers m with a representation

$$m = k_i - \sum_{j'=i}^{J-1} n_{j'}\Delta k_{j'} \tag{5.11}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $1 < i \leq \min\{j+1, J-1\}$.
(2) The coefficients $n_{j'}$ are nonnegative integers.
(3) If $i = j+1$, then $n_{j'} \neq 0$ for some j'.

Similar reasoning shows that G_{j+1} must also contain the integers given by the sums (5.11) with $i = 1$ and nonnegative integer coefficients provided that $n_1 = 0$ and the set of indices $j' \geq j+1$ for which $n_{j'} \neq 0$ has no gaps and contains $j+1$ unless that set is empty.

One can easily check that if each set G_{j+1} contains the points specified in the previous paragraph and no others, then conditions (5.6), (5.8) and (5.9) all hold. For uniformity, we elect instead to let G_{j+1} be the set of all integers m given by formula (5.11) with the three properties listed below it except for the requirement that $i > 1$. Conditions (5.6), (5.8) and (5.9) are again easy to check.

We strengthen the hypothesis (5.2) slightly by requiring that $\hat{f}$ vanish on the set $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j)) := \bigcup_{j=1}^{J}(k_j + D_j)$. Then

$$\mathrm{Sch}((k_j)) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{J-1}(G_{j+1} - \Delta k_j),$$

since D_J is empty and $k_j + D_j = G_{j+1} - \Delta k_j$ when $j < J$. It follows that $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ consists of all integers m represented by sums (5.11) with nonnegative integer coefficients $n_{j'}$ that do not all vanish.

Rewrite this in the form

$$m = \sum_{j'=1}^{J} \varepsilon_{j'} k_{j'}. \tag{5.12}$$

Then $m \in \mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ if and only if the integer coefficients $\varepsilon_{j'}$ satisfy the following conditions, which arose for dual methods in [6] and [17].

- The full sum $\sum_{j'=1}^{J} \varepsilon_{j'}$ is equal to 1.
- All partial sums of the full sum are nonnegative.
- All partial sums after the first positive one are positive.
- Some partial sum is greater than 1.

Extend the definition of $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ to infinite sequences (k_j) by taking the union of the sets $\mathrm{Sch}((k'_j))$ over all finite subsequences (k'_j) of (k_j).

Our direct proof of Paley's theorem yields the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Let K be a subset of the group $\mathbb{Z}$, and let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$. If $\hat{f}$ vanishes on $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ for some enumeration (k_j) of K, then*

$$\|\hat{f}|K\|_2 \le 2\|f\|_1. \tag{5.13}$$

Again, there is no requirement that K be strongly lacunary or that it be enumerated in increasing order. In many cases, $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ overlaps with K, and the hypothesis in the theorem then forces $\hat{f}$ to vanish on that overlap. When K is strongly lacunary and enumerated in increasing order, no such overlap can occur, because $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ is then included in the set of negative integers. In most cases, that inclusion is strict, and Theorem 5.1 sharpens Theorem 1.1.

As in Section 4, we can extend this to Fourier coefficients of measures. We can also replace $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ by a significantly smaller set, at the cost of using a larger constant in inequality (5.13). Let $S((k_j))$ consist of all integers m with representations (5.12) in which the coefficients $\varepsilon_{j'}$ belong to the set $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ and satisfy the four conditions for membership of m in $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$. Extend these notions to abelian groups.

Recall the definition of the set $\mathrm{Rsz}(K)$ in Section 4. Clearly,

$$S((k_j)) \subset \mathrm{Sch}((k_j)) \cap \mathrm{Rsz}(K). \tag{5.14}$$

We derive the following statement in the next section.

Theorem 5.2. *Let K be a subset of a discrete abelian group with dual G, and let μ be a regular Borel measure on G. If $\hat{\mu}$ vanishes on $\mathrm{Sch}((\gamma_j))$ for some enumeration (γ_j) of K, then*

$$\|\hat{\mu}|K\|_2 \le 4\|\mu\|. \tag{5.15}$$

Remark 5.3. The two theorems above were proved in the late 1970's in [6] via a dual construction using the Schur algorithm. That method yielded inequalities (5.13) and (5.15) with the smaller constants $\sqrt{2}$ and $2\sqrt{2}$. The utility of the methods used in the present paper was understood by the early 1970's, however, so that the application in [6]

to half of the Littlewood conjecture for exponential sums could have been obtained about five years earlier.

Remark 5.4. The dual construction in [6] led to another construction in [12] and [15]. It is clear from the analysis in [17] of the latter that it can also be used to prove Theorem 5.1, with constant 2.

Remark 5.5. The sets $\mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$, G_{j+1} and D_j can also be described using suitable partial orders or preorders on Z that are compatible with addition. For each index $j < J$, let P'_j be the semigroup generated by the differences $\Delta k_{i'}$ with $i' \geq j$. Write $m <_j n$ when $n - m \in P'_j$, with no requirement that $0 \notin P'_j$. Then

(1) $m \in \mathrm{Sch}((k_j))$ if and only if $m <_j k_j$ for some j.
(2) $m \in G_{j+1}$ if and only if $m <_{j+1} k_{j+1}$ or $m \leq_i k_i$ for some $i \leq j$.
(3) $m \in D_j$ if and only if $m <_{j+1} 0$ or $m \leq_i k_i - k_{j+1}$ for some $i \leq j$.

Remark 5.6. In the second case in the description of D_j just above, write $k_i - k_{j+1}$ as $-\sum_{j'=i}^{j} \Delta k_{j'}$. It follows that the members of D_j are those with a representation $-\sum_{j'} n_{j'} \Delta k_{j'}$ with integer coefficients $n_{j'}$ having the following properties.

- $n_{j'} \geq 0$ for all j'.
- $n_{j'} > 0$ for some j'.
- The set of indices $j' < j$ for which $n_{j'} \neq 0$ has no gaps and contains $j - 1$ unless that set is empty.

The antinesting property of the sets D_j is then obvious.

Remark 5.7. So is the fact that each D_j is an additive semigroup. Define preorders by saying that $m <_j^* n$ when $m - n \in D_j$. Rewrite conditions (5.3) to (5.5) as follows.

Membership**:** $k_j <_j^* k_{j+1}$ when $1 \leq j < J$.
Antinesting**:** If $m <_{j+1}^* n$, where $1 \leq j < J$, then $m <_j^* n$.
Nesting**:** If $m <_j^* k_{j+1}$, where $1 \leq j < J - 1$, then $m <_{j+1}^* k_{j+2}$.

The hypothesis in Theorem 5.1 is that $\hat{f}$ vanishes on the union of the sets $D_j + k_j$, that is $\hat{f}(n) = 0$ whenever there is some index j for which $n <_j^* k_j$. To fit our proof of Paley's theorem in Section 2 into this pattern, redefine the relation $m <_j^* 0$ to mean that $m < -k_j$ for the usual order $<$ on $\mathbb{Z}$; then $D_j + k_j$ is the usual negative cone in $\mathbb{Z}$, and the three conditions displayed above follow from strong lacunarity.

6. Direct Proof of Theorem 5.2

We work initially with stronger hypotheses.

Lemma 6.1. *Let K be a strongly lacunary set in a partially ordered discrete abelian group Γ, and let μ be a regular Borel measure on the dual of Γ. Enumerate K in increasing order by (γ_j). If $\hat{\mu}$ vanishes on $\mathrm{Sch}((\gamma_j)) \cap \mathrm{Rsz}(K)$, then*

$$\|\hat{u}|K\|_2 \le 4\|\mu\|. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove this when K is finite. Denote the group dual to Γ by G. The proof of Theorem 5.1 applies to functions in $L^1(G)$ whose coefficients vanish on $\mathrm{Sch}((\gamma_j))$. The method in Section 4 then yields inequality (6.1) when $\hat{\mu}$ vanishes on $\mathrm{Sch}((\gamma_j)) \cap \mathrm{Rsz}(K)$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Drop the order and lacunarity hypotheses, and enumerate K as $\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^J$. Form the product group $G \times \mathbb{T}^J$ and its dual $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}^J$. Totally order $\mathbb{Z}^J$ by declaring that $\vec{n}' < \vec{n}$ when the last nonzero component of $\vec{n} - \vec{n}'$ is positive. Let $\vec{k}^{(j)}$ be the member of $\mathbb{Z}^J$ whose only nonzero component is a 1 in the j-th position. The set $\{\vec{k}^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^J$ is *extremely lacunary* in the sense that, when $j < J$,

$$\vec{k}^{(j+1)} > m\vec{k}^{(j)} \quad \text{for all positive integers } m.$$

Define a partial order on $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}^J$ by declaring that

$$(\gamma', \vec{n}') < (\gamma, \vec{n}) \quad \text{when } \vec{n}' < \vec{n}.$$

Let $\tilde{K}$ be the set of of pairs $(\gamma_j, \vec{k}^{(j)})$ with that enumeration. Note that if $(\gamma, \vec{n}) \in S((\gamma_j, \vec{k}^{(j)}))$, then $\gamma \in S((\gamma_j))$. Also, $\tilde{K}$ is extremely lacunary, so that each member of $\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}^J$ has at most one representation as a sum of members of $\tilde{K}$ multiplied by integers. The inclusion (5.14) is often strict, but the extreme lacunarity here makes

$$S((\gamma_j, \vec{k}^{(j)})) = \mathrm{Sch}((\gamma_j, \vec{k}^{(j)})) \cap \mathrm{Rsz}(\tilde{K}). \tag{6.2}$$

Identify $\mathbb{T}$ with the interval $(-\pi, \pi]$ with addition modulo 2π. Identify G with the subgroup $G \times \{0\}$ of $G \times \mathbb{T}^J$. Given a measure μ on G form a measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on $G \times \mathbb{T}^J$ by first transferring μ to $G \times \{0\}$, and then extending it to vanish outside that subgroup. Note that $\|\tilde{\mu}\| = \|\mu\|$, and that $\hat{\tilde{\mu}}(\gamma, \vec{n}) = \hat{\mu}(\gamma)$ in all cases.

Suppose that $\hat{\mu}$ vanishes on $S((\gamma_j))$. Then $\hat{\tilde{\mu}}$ vanishes on $S((\gamma_j, \vec{k}^{(j)}))$. By equation (6.2), Lemma 6.1 applies to $\tilde{\mu}$, and yields that

$$\|\hat{\mu}|K\|_2 = \|\hat{\tilde{\mu}}|\tilde{K}\|_2 \le 4\|\tilde{\mu}\| = 4\|\mu\|. \qquad \square$$

References

1. G.F. Bachelis, W.A. Parker and K.A. Ross, *Local Units in $L^1(G)$,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (1972), 312–313.

2. J.M. Clunie, *On the derivative of a bounded function,* Proc. London Math. Soc. **14A** (1965), 58–68.
3. Frank Forelli, *Invariant subspaces in L^1,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (1963), 76–79.
4. John J.F. Fournier, *Extensions of a Fourier multiplier theorem of Paley,* Pacific J. Math. **30**, (1969), 415–431.
5. ———, *Fourier coefficients after gaps,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **42**, (1973), 255–270.
6. ———, *On a theorem of Paley and the Littlewood conjecture,* Ark. Mat. **17**, (1979), 199–216.
7. S. Kwapień and A. Pełczyński, *Some linear topological properties of the Hardy spaces H^p,* Compositio Math. **33** (1976), 261–288.
8. Françoise Lust-Piquard and Gilles Pisier, *Noncommutative Khintchine and Paley inequalities,* Ark. Mat. **29** (1991), 241–260.
9. Yves Meyer, *Endomorphismes des idéaux fermés de $L^1(G)$, classes de Hardy et séries de Fourier lacunaires,* Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **1** (1968), 499–580.
10. Daniel M. Oberlin, *Two multiplier theorems for $H^1(U^2)$.* Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2) **22** (1979), 43–47.
11. R.E.A.C. Paley, *On the lacunary coefficients of power series,* Ann. of Math. (2) **34** (1933), 615–616.
12. Louis Pigno, and Brent Smith, *Quantitative behaviour of the norms of an analytic measure,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **86** (1982), 581–585.
13. Walter Rudin, *Remarks on a theorem of Paley,* J. London Math. Soc. **32** (1957), 307–311.
14. ———, *Fourier analysis on groups,* Interscience, New York, 1962.
15. Brent Smith, *Two trigonometric designs: one-sided Riesz products and Littlewood products.* General inequalities, 3 (Oberwolfach, 1981), 141–148, Internat. Schriftenreihe Numer. Math., **64**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.
16. S. A. Vinogradov, *Interpolation theorems of Banach-Rudin-Carleson and norms of imbedding operators for certain classes of analytic functions,* (Russian) Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI) **19** (1970), 6–54.
17. V. A. Yudin, *Multidimensional versions of Paley's inequality,* (Russian. Russian summary) Mat. Zametki **70** (2001), 941–947; translation in Math. Notes **70** (2001).

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, 1984 Mathematics Road, Vancouver BC, Canada V6T 1Z2
E-mail address: fournier@math.ubc.ca